

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated October 6, 2003 has been carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this patent application. By this amendment, claims 7 and 15 have been canceled, and claims 19-31 have been added.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection**

Claims 7 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Such claims have been canceled.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Deutsch (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,194) in view of Blumstein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,589,855). Claims 7 and 15 have been canceled. Reconsideration of this claims 1-6, 9-14, and 16-17 is respectfully requested.

Discussion Regarding Patentability of Claim 10

*Claim 10*

Claim 10 recites the following:

an audio generator operative to produce audio feedback to the user in direct response to receipt of the signature, *the audio feedback correlated to graphic input of the received signature.* (Emphasis added.)

*Proposed Combination of Deutsch and Blumstein*

Presumably in an attempt to combine Deutsch and Blumstein in order to arrive at the invention of claim 10, the following was stated in the October 6, 2003 Office Action at page 3, lines 12-20:

Deutsch teaches a signature capture terminal 205 comprising a signature capture area operative to graphically receive a signature of a user (col 3, lines 12-16). Deutsch does not teach the producing audio feedback in response to receipt of user input. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Blumstein. Blumstein teaches the providing a terminal for visually impaired individuals which comprises the audio feedback in response to receipt of user input (col 2, lines 22-28).

It would have been obvious ... to modify the terminal [of] Deutsch to include audio feedback taught by Blumstein

The audio feedback of Blumstein identified by the Examiner in the 10/6/03 Office Action is set forth below (see Blumstein at column 2, lines 18-28):

[T]he electronic teller prompts or responds to user actions with sound cues or "beeps" in a similar way that current ATMs audibly interact with individuals who are not visually impaired. Thus, to one situated away from the user, the sounds are similar to those transmitted during operation in the conventional mode. The visually impaired user may enter the visually impaired person (VIP) mode by simply touching or tapping the upper right quadrant twice in succession, each tap confirmed by a beep and successful transition to the next step confirmed by a "good transition" sound.

Blumstein appears to merely disclose providing audible sounds to acknowledge actuation of various user inputs in a similar way to current ATMs. If

one were to provide Blumstein's type of audio feedback in the system of Deutsch, then the resulting Deutsch/Blumstein system would include audio feed that includes sound cues or "beeps" in a similar way to current ATMs.

However, this resulting system does not arrive at Applicant's invention of claim 10. Indeed, claim 10 does not merely recite generally providing audio feedback in response to a user writing a signature on a signature capture device. Rather, claim 10 requires "an audio generator operative to produce audio feedback ..., the audio feedback [being] correlated to graphic input of the received signature." This *correlation* is described in detail in Applicant's specification at, among other places, page 8, line 4 through page 9, line 17. Neither Deutsch nor Blumstein discloses anything remotely similar to this.

Thus, proposed combination Deutsch and Blumstein does not arrive at the invention of claim 10. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the proposed combination of Deutsch and Blumstein does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with respect to the invention of Applicant's claim 10.

Discussion Re: Patentability of Claims 11-14

Each of claims 11-14 depends directly or indirectly from claim 10. As a result, each of claims 11-14 are allowable for the reasons hereinbefore discussed with regard to claim 10.

Discussion Re: Patentability of Claim 1

The discussion relating to the patentability of claim 10 is relevant to the patentability of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited art.

Discussion Re: Patentability of Claims 2-6 and 8-9

Each of claims 2-6 and 8-9 depends directly or indirectly from claim 1. As a result, each of claims 2-6 and 8-9 are allowable for the reasons hereinbefore discussed with regard to claim 1.

Discussion Re: Patentability of Claim 16

The discussion relating to the patentability of claim 10 is relevant to the patentability of claim 16. Thus, claim 16 is believed to be allowable over the cited art.

Discussion Re: Patentability of Claims 17-18

Each of claims 17-18 depends directly or indirectly from claim 16. As a result, each of claims 17-18 are allowable for the reasons hereinbefore discussed with regard to claim 16.

**Newly Added Claims 19-31**


Newly added claims 19-31 recite novel and nonobvious limitations. Thus, each of claims 19-31 is allowable over the cited art.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Action to that end is hereby solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MAGINOT, MOORE & BECK LLP



Paul J. Maginot  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,984

February 6, 2004

Maginot, Moore & Beck  
Bank One Center/Tower  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3000  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5115  
Phone: (317) 638-2922  
Fax: (317) 638-2139